

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

or in combination, provides a suggestion or motivation to combine the references to produce a manager system for monitoring alerts comprising a “user interface configured to allow a user to selectively disable automatic display of one or more . . . alerts by selecting or deselecting in said user interface at least one alert type corresponding to said alerts,” as recited in amended Claim 35.

The Examiner took the position that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Dev, in view of Weele, in order “to prevent sensory overload on the human operator responsible for control of the management console.” Applicant respectfully submits, however, that no such motivation can be found in the prior art of record. In fact, Weele appears to be more concerned with ensuring that the operator acknowledges every single alarm issued by the system than with preventing sensory overload of the operator. In this regard, Applicant incorporates herein by reference arguments presented in pages 5 and 6 of Applicant’s “Response to Office Action” dated June 8, 2001.

II. Discussion of Reasons For the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner implied that Claims 1, 13, 22, 25, and 34 were allowable since these claims include a limitation “wherein [a] user enables or disables automatic display of alerts by selecting or deselecting a corresponding alert type in [a] graphic display,” which limitation the prior art of record fails to teach, singly or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the patentability of Claims 1, 13, 22, 25, and 34 is found in considering each claim as a whole, rather than in focusing on any single limitation. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 13, 22, 25 and 34 each includes its own patentable features, which are not limited to that limitation singled out by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner’s concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 10/29/01 By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619) 687-8632

\DOCS_SD\FILES\DOCS\Jfk\JFK-1288.doc